

III. Remarks

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 3, and 5-13 have been amended. No new matter is believed added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,058,389 to Chandra et al. (Chandra). It is respectfully submitted that Chandra fails to teach (or suggest) each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 6, 9, 11 and 12, the claimed invention includes a group of computer programs within a group of cooperating communication managers. Specifically, as shown in Fig. 2 and disclosed through the specification, the claimed invention facilitates the cooperation of separate communication managers (e.g., queue managers). Each cooperating communication manager can include one or more applications/programs for accessing or otherwise managing data stored in local queues or in shared queues that are accessible to all cooperating communication managers. To this extent, under the claimed invention, the cooperating communication managers can access data stored locally, or stored in shared access memory that is accessible to all of the cooperating communication managers (see e.g., claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10 and 13). In addition, because the claimed invention accommodates multiple cooperating communication managers, command target qualifiers are provided to specifically identify the cooperating communication managers to which a command (for operating on data) should be targeted. Such command target qualifiers include a target command qualifier that allows a command to be targeted to all cooperating communication managers (see e.g., claims 1 and 8).

Such features are not taught by Chandra. For example, Chandra fails to teach a group of cooperating communication managers. As stated on column 6, lines 17-20 of Chandra, "[t]he relational database system 304 comprises database server 310 stored in a volatile memory 306 of a processor, such as main memory 104 of computer system 100." As discussed in conjunction with Fig. 1 of Chandra, computer system 100 corresponds to a single client that communicates with a server. To this extent, Chandra fails to teach a group of cooperating communication managers as claimed by the present invention. Along these lines, Chandra also fails to teach shared access memory that is accessible by a group of cooperating communication managers. Rather, the teachings of Chandra focus on data that is stored locally on an individual client. Still yet, Chandra fails to teach command target qualifiers that specifically identify cooperating communication managers to which a command (for operating on data) should be targeted. Specifically, the ENQUEUE and DEQUEUE operations discussed by Chandra fail to represent command target qualifiers that specifically identify cooperating communication managers to which a command should be targeted. Accordingly, because Chandra fails to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the above-referenced rejection.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald A. D'Alessandro
Reg. No.: 42,456

Date: 1/27/04
Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
Three E-Comm Square
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

Serial No.: 09/579,677

10